



SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION FEBRUARY 24, 2005 FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Commissioners in Attendance: Hilda Blanco, George Blomberg, Tom Eanes, Jerry Finrow, Chris Fiori, Martin Kaplan, Valerie Kinast, Lyn Krizanich, John Owen, Joe Quintana, Steve Sheehy

Commissioners Absent: Anjali Bhagat, Mahlon Clements, Matthew Kitchen, Mimi Sheridan, Tony To

Commission Staff: Barbara Wilson, Director; Elizabeth Martin, Analyst; Robin Magonegil, Administrative Assistant

Guests: Marsha Holbrook, Mark Griffin, David McCraney, Port of Seattle; Martin Regge, NBBJ; Dave Gering, Manufacturing and Industrial Council; Ron Borowski, SDOT; Elma Borbe, Legislative Aide for Councilmember Della; Bob Morgan, Central Staff

Call to Order

Chair George Blomberg called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Steve Sheehy moved and Commissioner Jerry Finrow seconded to approve the February 10, 2005 Commission minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

UPDATES

▪ Upcoming Activities

Planning Commission Director Barbara Wilson announced a number of upcoming meetings. She encouraged Commissioners to attend the Housing, Neighborhoods and Urban Centers Committee meeting on March 8 noting that members of the City Neighborhood Council would be attending to have a discussion about Neighborhood Planning. She also noted that, at the Transportation Committee meeting on March 17, a representative from Sound Transit will be there to brief the committee on the update to the Long Range Plan and Sound Transit Phase 2. Ms. Wilson reminded the Commissioners about the retreat on March 10 from 1:00 to 5:30.

Chair Blomberg noted that immediately following today's Full Commission Meeting, Members of the Commission would be reviewing the Neighborhood Business District Strategy (NBDS) letter with Diane Sugimura and DPD staff. All of the Commissioners were invited to stay for this meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Elma Borbe, a legislative aide for City Councilmember David Della introduced herself to the Commissioners noting that Councilmember Della is closely following Industrial and Manufacturing issues.

COMMISSION PROJECT REVIEW

INDUSTRIAL LANDS POLICY ISSUES

Presentation: Port of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Amendment – North Bay Project: Chair Blomberg welcomed Marsha Holbrook and Mark Griffin, Port of Seattle, Government Relations; and Martin Regge, NBBJ. He stated that he would be recusing himself from any participation in discussion on the presentation due to his direct connection with the Port of Seattle but that he would help facilitate the meeting as his role as Chair of the Commission

Ms. Holbrook shared some of the Port's history noting that The Port of Seattle was founded in 1911. The previous year they had 28.8 million passengers at SeaTac Airport, 1.8 TEU's at Seattle Port, and that there are 2 cruise terminals that they have projected will have 180 calls this year. Ms. Holbrook called attention to the Port's mission statement which is to create economic vitality here and stated that the work that the Port does supports the revenues that go back to the city, the county and the state. In 2003 that was 626 million dollars in revenue to the City and the State. She then introduced Mark Griffin noting he would begin the powerpoint presentation on the Port's T-91 / Northbay proposal.

Mark Griffin introduced himself noting that he is also with the Port and is working on the North Bay Project. Mr. Griffin then delivered a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation overview covered the project area, objectives, market and financial analysis, EIS process and alternatives, fiscal and economic impact analysis and the framework development plan. Mr. Griffin then gave an overview on the site noting that the North Bay site is part of the Terminal 91 complex located in Interbay and is about 57 acres. He stated that a portion of the site houses the National Guard and there is a large greenbelt area.

For more information please refer to the attached document that went along with the PowerPoint presentation or view on line at <http://www.cityofseattle.net/planningcommission/minutes.htm>

Commissioner John Owen asked if the overlay would specify restrictions on housing as to where housing might be located, the amount of housing or the percentage of the total site. Mr. Griffin answered that to the extent that housing is included, there would be restrictions but that they did not think that housing was appropriate everywhere within the area. He added that transit-oriented housing development close to the transit hub makes sense. Primarily they feel that housing would be a way to knit the site back into the neighborhood. He stated that the Port will

complete its Draft EIS in April and the Final EIS in July. The EIS analyzes it only in specific sub-zones within the overall planning area. Mr. Regge added that they are also looking at a variety of housing types.

Commissioner Joe Quintana asked what assumptions went into the fiscal & economic impact analysis. Mr. Griffin responded that it is keyed off of the development alternatives and takes the square footage in each of the six development alternatives and then makes a calculation. Commissioner Quintana noted that in the residential components there are fewer jobs and yet the mission statement states that it would add employment. He questioned how this squares with the mission statement. Mr. Griffin responded that residential is a potential attractor for certain types of industry. He stated the thinking is that residential could generate a new source of revenue that can support activities that the Port undertakes that do not generate revenue in and of themselves. He stated that residential could help improve the project's overall financial returns. He added that there are other public policy objectives that they think housing also helps contribute to; growth management, sustainability, and transit-oriented development.

Commissioner Sheehy questioned if there was a desire for a commuter rail station. Mr. Griffin replied that there is a potential for a commuter rail station or even a water taxi and that it makes sense to leverage the transit investments in keeping with effective regional growth management. He stated that there is the ability to link these transit modes at this location on the north side.

Commissioner Hilda Blanco asked about what type of environmental impact the existing industrial uses have. Mr. Griffin explained that they are doing a pretty exhaustive assessment of that in the EIS and are taking careful consideration of how to make sure that they are stacking uses in a way to create real harmony between uses. Commissioner Blanco stated that they know now that buffers really do not work when it comes to some kinds of air pollutants. She asked what kind of current industrial uses there are on site. Mr. Griffin answered that the existing industrial uses are characterized as more toward light industrial. He explained that the site is huge and that any residential is not going to be right next to the existing industrial uses. He added that the Port considers that certain zones within the overall planning area may be compatible for residential use. He stated that one of the key objectives is making sure that the Port does not compromise the ongoing viability of the site for industrial uses.

Commissioner Chris Fiori asked that to what extent has the planning process included a risk analysis with respect to all the projects that are questionable right now. He asked how people are going to get to and from I-5. Commissioner Fiori pointed out that if there is no Alaskan Way Viaduct in the future and the Mercer corridor redevelopment project is underway and the Monorail is not up and running that these transportation projects will potentially have a huge impact on the site. He also asked if the Port had looked at the South Waterfront area as they are trying to phase in transit over time. Mr. Griffin stated that they are not sure how all the transportation issues will play out but they are trying to anticipate the possibility for transportation choices to be connected as they are built out. Mr. Griffin added that in terms of the Port's development planning they feel that the sight will be built out over 10 to 20 years and the Draft EIS is broadly taking a look at traffic impacts and how they see development on the site occurring over time.

Commissioner Jerry Finrow asked how the developments at Terminal 91 (T-91) affect the planning strategies in the rest of the city. He offered the example of greater housing density in

the Center City Strategy and asked if this project would affect the housing goals of the Center City Strategy in some way. He expressed that he felt that one of the things that the Port should pay attention to is the broader framework. He felt that the planning that they had done thus far was impressive but the Commission's concern has more to do with how this plan affects the rest of the city. Commissioner Finrow pointed out the redevelopment underway in South Lake Union and asked if the Port project at T-91 might compete with biotech and research and development expansions in South Lake Union. Mr. Griffin expressed that he looked forward to more dialogue with the Commission about how to make sure the Port gives consideration to the broader issues city-wide.

Commissioner John Owen stated that it looked like the plan basically deals with infrastructure and how to get as much flexibility in regards to use. He felt that it would be better to have some sort of design guidelines that look at the bulk and the massing and how the industrial areas might relate. Commissioner Owen also noted that he felt that the Port might want to reconsider the placement of the roadway at the base of the hill. He suggested that there might be some instances when the roadway might be pulled back further from the hillside. He pointed out that the roadway could cut off public access to natural areas. He pointed out that the base of the hill might be a good location for wetlands redevelopment or some other natural feature. He recommended that the roadway might be better located further inland away from the base of the bluff. He also expressed that there might be some kind of provision for affordable housing development as a component of the proposed residential use. Mr. Griffin responded that this is the first layer of the master plan and that as the Port moves through the remainder of the planning process there will be more detail that will show how the various mix of uses will relate to one other on the site.

Chair Blomberg thanked the Port and then asked the Commissioners what they think the next steps should be in follow up of this presentation. Commissioner Owen responded with his suggestion that they write a letter thanking the Port for their presentation and encouraging them to move on and reiterate some of the points that were made.

Ms. Holbrook added that if anyone would like to see the site they would be happy to take them on a tour.

Commissioner Finrow mentioned that he thought the Commission would be asked to weigh in on the Port's request for a Comp Plan amendment and asked when that might be.

Bob Morgan, Central Staff, said that the City Council would decide in April what amendments would be on the docket for this year. The Comp Plan amendment request comes back to the Council for discussion in the fall and the final Council decision is at the end of September.

Commissioner Finrow wondered if there would be enough further information on this and felt that the deadlines were very soon. He also asked if the overlay information was available. Ms. Wilson stated that she had it and could make copies but requested that it be sent to her electronically.

Presentation :The State of Seattle's Industrial Lands Chair Blomberg introduced Dave Gering, Chair of the Manufacturing and Industrial Council. Mr. Gering gave some background information on the Manufacturing and Industrial Council (MIC). He stated that the MIC is a

nonprofit advocacy group for industrial businesses in the city and that they publish a quarterly magazine called "Seattle Industry". They have about 60 to 70 dues paying members among them; Starbucks, Boeing, the Seattle Times and the Mariners but typically the companies are family owned and are 70-100 years old.

In regards to the North Bay project, Mr. Gering expressed that residential is very problematic for their group and that they get very nervous when there is a mix of industry and residential. He explained that the GMA is the guiding public policy as well as the designation of two Manufacturing and Industrial Centers to concentrate industrial uses in Seattle in Ballard-Interbay and the Duwamish. He added that in terms of the infrastructure that should be considered for North Bay that pedestrian improvements would not be the first thing that the Manufacturing and Industrial Council would think of. He stated that the Council would instead focus on deep water moorage improvements for enormous fishing vessels.

Mr. Gering pointed out that the magnitude of industrial revenue was captured by a study the city did last year which identified, based on B&O tax records, that industrial businesses in the city of Seattle generate about 28.5 billion dollars a year in sales. He stated that Seattle continues to have the greatest concentration of industrial employment in the State of Washington. He added that part of the reason for this is geography. He noted that our proximity to Alaska is enormously important. Mr. Gering stated that there are 640,000 people who live in Alaska who depend on Seattle and Tacoma for almost everything they need. A great deal of the items shipped to Alaska are made in Seattle. Mr. Gering went on to state that he believed Trident Seafoods is the biggest seafood company in North America.

Mr. Gering pointed out that the revenue and jobs located in Seattle are comparable to all the revenue and jobs combined in the manufacturing and industrial centers of Kent, Tukwila and Renton.

He explained that the main point that he wanted to make was zoning alone is not what is going to help industry stay and grow in Seattle but that it is going to take a proactive effort on the part of the City of Seattle and the Port. The one thing that the Manufacturing and Industrial Council thinks the City should explore for North Bay is a planned action provision under SEPA. Mr. Gering noted that this is a very successful tool that was invented for Boeing which makes permitting much easier. They feel that North Bay would be an ideal site for this implementing tool because of the limited number of property owners and the large amount of the property.

Chair Blomberg thanked Mr. Gering for his presentation and then opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Sheehy requested that the Port and the Manufacturing and Industrial Council supply the Commission with any materials or information they can to help the Commission analyze the Port's Comp Plan amendment request at T-91 and to formulate an industrial lands policy framework. He stated that the Port is starting with a fundamental assumption that a mix of different land uses is necessary at Terminal 91 and he felt that he would have to be convinced that this assumption is true. Mr. Griffin stated that they can provide some additional documentation to support why they feel that the assumption is sound.

Commissioner Owen questioned how the different parts manufacturing and industry work together and if there are any materials on how the different functions work together. Mr. Gering stated that there was a study that looked at maritime industries from a cluster prospective and Seattle was off the chart for maritime activities. He noted that there are some very compelling reasons for this. He stated that most of their industries are owned by Seattle residents who have strong business and personal relationships and ties to the area. Mr. Gering offered to get the OED industrial cluster analysis report to Barbara Wilson.

Commissioner Finrow asked if Mr. Gering had a chance to look at the overlay technical detail that the Port had prepared. Mr. Gering answered that he had not. He explained that the Industrial and Manufacturing Council's concern was with the Growth Management Act and asked why residential is part of the Port's proposal at T-91 since it is currently zoned for industrial uses in the Ballard-Interbay-Manufacturing and Industrial Center. Commissioner Finrow then stated that what would be helpful to the Commission would be for Mr. Gering's organization to prepare a short letter that states their views on the Port's proposed zoning changes. Mr. Gering responded that he had brought such a letter from the Manufacturing and Industrial Council and that he would leave the letter with Ms. Wilson.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Blomberg adjourned the meeting at 9:00 a.m.